

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 7, 9-10, 12, and 15-17 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶2 as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0015375 (Cogliandro).

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office has rejected claims 1-18 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 10, 12, and 16 to recite, "[a] computer implemented method for ..." (See claims 1, 7, 10, 12, and 16). Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, claims 8-9 depend from claim 7, claim 11 depends from claim 10, claims 13-15 depend from claim 12, and claims 17-18 depend from claim 16. Applicants assert that this amendment further directs the invention to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-30 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office has asserted that claims 1-30 are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 10 to recite, "...to identify and address risks[.]" Applicants assert that these amendments further clarify the invention. Applicants submit, with respect to claims 12, 16, and 28, that a method and program product "...for arranging business process control point information in a template," is definite because it particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants further submit, with respect to claims 19, 23, and 26, that "[a] template for arranging business process control point information," is definite because it particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

C. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-30 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection over Cogliandro, Applicants assert that Cogliandro does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to claims 1, 7, and 10, Applicants submit that Cogliandro fails to teach, *inter alia*, arranging information pertaining to the control points in a standard format using a template, and storing the template in a computer database to provide subsequent access to the template. In support of its rejection, the Office asserts, with respect to *claim 9*, that Fig. 10, element 1020 of Cogliandro discloses the step of storing the template. Office Action, p. 6. Interpreting Cogliandro only for the purposes of this response, Applicants submit that Cogliandro merely teaches "[m]emory 1020 compris[ing] database 1021 for storing data utilized by the processor

09/884,095

Page 12 of 15

Best Available Copy

and the user interface.” See ¶ 0118. However, Cogliandro fails to disclose storing the template in a computer database. In contrast, the present invention discloses inputting information into a template, and storing the template in a computer database to provide subsequent access to the template. This feature allows a detailed history of each template to be kept in the database for later access by reviewers and/or auditors. The present invention allows all pertinent business process and/or control point information to be arranged in a standard format and stored so that reviewers and/or auditors can efficiently and accurately access the information. Thus, storing a template in a computer database, as in the present invention, is not equivalent to storing data utilized by a processor and a user interface, as in Cogliandro. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to dependent claims 2-6, 8-9, 11, 13-15, and 17-18, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

With respect to claim 16, Applicants assert that Cogliandro fails to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, including arranging a set of actions in an action field. In support of its rejection, the Office asserts that Fig. 6, element 640 of Cogliandro discloses arranging a set of actions in an action field, wherein the set of actions addresses the identified risks. See Office Action, p. 8. Applicants submit that neither the element cited by the Office, nor Cogliandro as a whole, disclose arranging a set of actions in an action field. Interpreting Cogliandro only for the purposes of this response, Applicants submit that element 640 of Cogliandro merely discloses “...strategic intent items that are goals of the firm.” See ¶ 0091. In contrast, the present invention teaches, *inter alia*, the step of arranging a set of actions in an

Best Available Copy

action field. See claim 16. Once a control point/risk is identified, a set of actions can be arranged in the template and then implemented to address the risk. Accordingly, Applicants submit that identifying general goals of a firm, as disclosed by Cogliandro, is not equivalent to arranging a set of actions in an action field in a template, as disclosed by the present invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to independent claims 19, 23, 26, and 28 Applicants herein incorporate the arguments made above with respect to claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

Applicants further submit, with respect to claim 26, that Cogliandro fails to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, including a test execution field for arranging a test entity, an action execution field for arranging an action entity, and an audit field for arranging audit details. In support of its rejection, the Office asserts that FIG. 1, elements 120, 130, and 140 disclose each of the following steps, respectively: arranging a test entity in a test execution field, arranging an action entity in an action execution field, and arranging audit details in an audit field. Office Action, p. 7. Applicants submit that FIG. 1 is merely a flow chart outlining steps of the invention, but not a template with execution and audit fields. Cogliandro fails to disclose a test execution field, an action execution field, or an audit field. In contrast, the present invention discloses, *inter alia*, a test execution field, an action execution field, or an audit field. The test execution field is for arranging the test entity responsible for carrying out the indicated set of tests, the action field is for arranging the set of actions to be taken to address an identified risk, and the audit field provides audit details such as instructions in the event of an audit. Cogliandro fails to disclose these features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

09/884,095

Page 14 of 15

Best Available Copy


With respect to dependent claims 17-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27, and 29-30, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 27, 2005


Ronald A. D'Alessandro
Reg. No.: 42,456

(DLP)

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
Three E-Comm Square
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

Best Advocate ever